

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, 1902.

The Remonstrance is published annually by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, California, South Dakota and other states who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views, in the interest of fair discussion.

State Organizations Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Thirty Branch Committees; members in 191 cities and towns.

PRESIDENT.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY.

TREASURER.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN.

SECRETARY Pro Tem.

MRS. WILLIAM T. SEDGWICK, The Westminster, Copley Square, Boston.

NEW YORK.

MRS. FRANCIS M. SCOTT, President.
MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE, 1st Vice-President and Chairman of Executive Committee.
MRS. ELIHU ROOT, 2d Vice-President.
MRS. RICHARD WATSON GILDER, 3d Vice-President.
MRS. GEORGE WADDINGTON, Treasurer.
MRS. GEORGE PHILLIPS, Secretary,
165 West 82d Street, New York City.

Chairmen of Auxiliaries.

MRS. WILLIAM PUTNAM, 70 Willow Street, Brooklyn.
MRS. PHILIP SCHUYLER VAN PATTEN,
146 Prospect Avenue, Mt. Vernon.
MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNELL, 9 Hall Place, Albany.
MRS. GEORGE PARKHURST, 560 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo.

ILLINOIS.

MRS. CAROLINE F. CORBIN, President.
MRS. R. J. OGLESBY,
MRS. S. M. NICKERSON, } Vice-Presidents.
MRS. HORATIO N. MAY,
MRS. JAMES B. BARNET, Secretary,
1923 Deming Court, Chicago.

OREGON.

MRS. R. W. WILBUR, President.
MRS. W. S. LADD, 1st Vice-President.
MRS. J. B. MONTGOMERY, 2d Vice-President.
MRS. WALLACE McCAMANT, Treasurer.
MISS ELIZABETH M. CARSON, Secretary,
183 20th St., North, Portland.

IOWA COMMITTEE.

MRS. MARTIN FRYNN.
MRS. SIMON CASADY.
MISS EMILY F. STOROA.
MRS. J. H. MERRILL,
509 West 4th Street, Des Moines.

RHODE ISLAND COMMITTEE.

Providence.

MRS. WILLIAM ELY, Chairman.

WASHINGTON COMMITTEES.

Seattle.

MRS. JOHN LEARY, President.
MRS. S. B. HARDIN, Vice-President.
MRS. G. D. BACON, Secretary,
512 10th Avenue.

Tacoma.

MRS. CHAUNCEY W. GRIGGS, President.
MRS. FITCH B. STACEY, Vice-President.
MRS. A. B. BULL, Secretary,
924 G Street, North Tacoma.

The Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women desires to put on record its appreciation of the character of its late president, Mrs. J. Elliot Cabot, and its sense of the great loss that her death brings to each and all personally, as well as to the work throughout the state.

While intensely devoted to her home and family, Mrs. Cabot was always active in all matters pertaining to the advancement of her fellow-men, and she was constantly called upon to fill important positions.

She was one of the first women elected an overseer of the poor in Massachusetts, and when after many years of faithful service she gave up that position in Brookline, it was to become a member of the school committee.

She was also chairman of the Volunteer Aid Association and president of the Mayflower Club.

Always strongly opposed to suffrage for women, Mrs. Cabot was early identified with the movement against it, and soon after the organization of this Association, she was, in May, 1897, chosen to be its president.

Through all this time her calm judgment, her ready resource in emergency, and her unfailing interest have been a constant help, while her written words for the cause have been an inspiration to many. No paper has been more widely read than the one she prepared for parlor meetings, and its arguments and its sentiment appealed to all who heard it.

Though averse to speaking in public, she was always ready to do it when she felt that duty called, and the little that she said, she said wisely and with dignity. Her influence has been far-reaching and her presence will be sadly missed.

Truly she rests from her labors, and her works do follow her. May they prove a helpful example to her fellow-workers!

IN COLORADO AND WYOMING.

THE reports upon "Woman's Suffrage and Municipal Politics," contributed to the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* for November, by Professor Le Rossignol of the University of Denver, for Colorado, and by Professor Roberts of the University of Wyoming, for Wyoming, are noticeable chiefly for the very guarded approval which they give to woman suffrage in those states, so far as they approve it at all. These reports are the first testimony which has been given from impartial observers, and they are in marked contrast with the extravagant claims of the suffragists.

WOMEN'S VOTE IN MASSACHUSETTS.

AN appendix to the Monthly Bulletin of the Statistics Department of the city of Boston for October, 1901, gives some interesting facts and conclusions regarding the vote of women in Boston and Massachusetts. The statistician says:—

Inspection of the following table suggests that the interest of the women voters of Boston in the election of School Committee is subject to marked fluctuation. Thus the average number registered for twenty-two years was 6,753, ranging between 567 in 1882 and 20,252 in 1888; the average number who voted ranged between 498 in 1882 and 19,490 in 1888, being on the average 5,486.* Similarly the per cent of registered who voted, which averaged 81.23 for the whole period, ranged from 59.62 in 1898 to 96.24 in 1888.

The statistician further shows that, according to the census of 1895, there were, in Massachusetts, when the "referendum" on the question of giving women municipal suffrage was taken, 811,321 women of voting age. Assuming that 75 per cent of these were potential legal voters, as was the ratio with men, there should have been 493,494 women registered, if the women of the state had exercised their rights of suffrage in equal proportion with the men. But the number of women who registered was only 42,676, and of these only 23,065, or 54.06 per cent, voted: 22,204 voting "Yes" and 861 "No."

*The number who voted in 1901 was 11,620.

SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS OF THE SUFFRAGE QUESTION.

DISCUSSING "Some Scientific Aspects of the Woman Suffrage Question" in *Gunton's Magazine* for April, 1901, Mrs. William T. Sedgwick pointed out one fundamental fallacy of the suffrage agitation:—

Our trouble lies in calling women a distinct class, and in regarding the question from the point of view of the individual rather than of the whole state and nation. The men and women of a given stratum of society form *one class* together; for men and women living together, whether in tenements or palaces, are not antagonistic nor even indifferent to each other's welfare. It is only in comparing the exceptional woman with the average man, or the educated and public-spirited woman with the ignorant laborer that we get an apparent basis for equal suffrage. The whole agitation is founded upon a misapprehension of the social unit, which is not the individual but the family, of which each part contributes its share to the general good.

Those who argue that women would purify politics think of women of the higher type, more conscientious than men of less education and lower moral standards. But the vote of this kind of woman does not replace that of an idle, worthless man. If she votes, so does he, and the women of his family. Where is the gain of doubling the vote without improving its quality?

Mrs. Sedgwick also showed that the suffrage movement, so far from being one of progress, is a backward movement:—

Equality does not necessarily mean similarity of functions, and the suffrage agitation is a retrograde movement, which, carried to its logical conclusion, would take the race back towards the condition in which no sex characteristics existed. For, the farther back we go in the scale of animal development, the less is the difference between the sexes, until we reach primitive forms of life in which sex is indistinguishable. Women in civilized nations differ more from the men about them than do those in savage tribes, history here confirming the teachings of evolution. Parkman says: "The social power of women has grown with the growth of civilization, but their political power has diminished. In former times and under low social conditions women had a degree of power in public affairs unknown in the foremost nations of the modern world. The most savage tribes on this continent, the Six Nations of New York, listened in solemn assembly to the counsels of its matrons, with a deference that has no parallel among its civilized successors. Four hundred years before Christ the question of giving power to

women was agitated among the most civilized of ancient peoples, the Athenians, and they would not follow the example of their barbarian neighbours." This movement for full suffrage, therefore, seems historically to be in a backward direction.

AN OPINION CHANGED, AND WHY.

WHEN I was a girl in college, it was taken for granted by most of us that the suffrage was one of the coming facts for women,—as certain as the Baccalaureate degree or that of Doctor of Philosophy. Most of the women under whom we worked in college, notably Maria Mitchell, were ardently in favor of suffrage for women; and I saw no reason to question their position. Ten years after leaving college, however, I found it necessary to give reasons for the faith that was in me. Accordingly, I reviewed the whole situation, and studied, as far as possible, the history of the suffrage among English-speaking people. I speedily found that conclusions which I had taken as a matter of course were open to grave doubt, and after much thought I arrived at the theory which I am now going to set forth for you.

We come to the practical question of what would be the effect upon the country if women were now permitted to vote. The United States is to-day in grave peril from too wide an extension of the franchise. The corruption of our great cities is chiefly the result of a mass of ignorant voters. The wild heresies, financial and social, which sweep over our country every few years find their force and danger among the ignorant. You must remember that the question is not whether you and I are better fitted to vote than the man that loafs on the benches of Boston Common, or that shovels sand on a Western railway, or breaks stones in the South. The question is whether he is better fitted to vote than his wife and his daughter, or whether we shall remedy the evil of his vote by adding to it that of his wife and daughter.

The truth is that in what, for want of a better phrase, we must call the lower ranks of society, the average political intelligence of women is far below that of men. It is easy to say that this is due to the fact that women have not been brought to acquire knowledge of politics, since they have had no voice in them. I doubt if this is true. The difference seems to me to be a fundamental intellectual one,—a method of thought rather than a lack of thought. Even granting that it be not so, however, it is obvious that it would take at least two generations to cure the evil. To instruct a whole sex in political duties would be a gigantic task.—*Heloise Edwina Hersey, in "To Girls."*

THE CASE OF KANSAS.

THE women of Kansas have enjoyed the right of full municipal suffrage since 1887. According to the champions of woman suffrage, the experiment has been very successful.

Yet, in 1891, the Kansas legislature rejected a bill to confer general suffrage upon women, and a constitutional amendment for the same purpose. In 1894, a suffrage amendment was defeated at the polls by a majority of 34,827. In 1895, bills for Presidential suffrage, and to confer the suffrage upon certain specified women failed. In 1897, the House refused even to discuss a Presidential suffrage bill. Last year a Presidential suffrage bill again failed.

There are few things more remarkable or significant in the history of the woman suffrage movement than these repeated refusals of a state which has tried municipal woman suffrage to give women any additional voting privileges.

TAXATION AND THE BALLOT.

THE argument that women who pay taxes ought, on that account, to be allowed to vote, is a specious one. It assumes that there is, under the American system, a connection between the ownership of property and the exercise of the suffrage, when, in fact, no such connection exists.

Taxes have been well defined as "contributions levied and collected by the state for the protection, benefit and advancement of the whole community. They are levied alike and in the same proportion upon the property of voters and non-voters, of aliens and citizens, of infants and adults, of men and women."

From the manner in which taxation is levied, therefore, and the purposes for which its proceeds are used, it is clear that there is no recognized relation between taxation and the voting power. If the principle that women who pay taxes should for that reason vote is true, the converse is true, namely, that men who do not pay taxes ought not to be allowed to vote. To admit to the ballot the small minority of women who are taxpayers, the state should, in consistency, disfranchise the large majority of men who are not taxpayers. It should also give the owner of property the right to vote wherever he owns property, thus endowing a single individual with a number of votes. It should also give the holder of large properties more votes than a small taxpayer. It is only necessary to contemplate the logical consequences of connecting the right to vote with the ownership of property to perceive the fallacy of the reasoning which demands the ballot for taxpaying women not because they are women, not because they are intelligent, not because they are capable, but because they pay taxes.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN NEW ZEALAND.

It has been generally supposed that, since the women of New Zealand were given the full franchise in 1893 they have possessed equal political privileges with men. This is not the case. It appears that they are not only not permitted to sit in Parliament, but that they cannot act as jurors or even serve on school boards. An address on "The Disabilities of Women" was made before the Women's National Council at its last annual meeting at Wanganui, which contained some surprising complaints. The speaker said:—

It was left for New Zealand to devise the modern compromise of the vote without the seat. Now an exclusively male House frames unequal and unfair laws for both sexes, and has even passed such in spite of the protest of large numbers of both men and women. . . . We are told it would be unwomanly for women to sit in Parliament. . . . The National Council has often pointed out the need there is for women justices, both as visitors to our female prisoners and on the bench, but nothing is done. There are many competent women whose services as jurors are at present a real need to the community. It appears a woman in New Zealand cannot now legally take her seat on either school boards or committees.

It appears also that the incidental advantages to women which are expected to accompany the franchise have not been realized in New Zealand. One of the papers read before the National Council urged "The Economic Independence of Women," and another on "The Ethics of Wage Earning" demanded for women equal pay for equal work, whether in government or in private service.

As to the effect of woman suffrage upon public life in New Zealand, Mr. J. Grattan Grey, a journalist long resident in Australasia, in his volume entitled "Australasia Old and New," recently published by E. P. Dutton & Co., gives the following discouraging account:—

Not only has it not fulfilled any one of the improving and refining services which were claimed for it when the measure was before Parliament, but, as an absolute fact, public and political life and the *personnel* of Parliament itself have degenerated to a most deplorable degree ever since the introduction of female franchise at Parliamentary elections in that colony.

The *New York Nation* of December 12, 1901, remarks of Mr. Grey's book that it "claims the careful consideration of reformers."

AN IMPRACTICABLE SUBSTITUTION.

Writing in the *International Monthly* for June, 1901, upon "The American Woman," Professor Hugo Munsterberg of Harvard University observes that it is simply not true and cannot be made true by any dialectics "that the minds of men and women are equal, and can be substituted the one for the other, without changing the entire character of the mental product. It is not true that men and women can do the same work in every line. . . . Neither coeducation nor the equality of opportunities has done anything to eliminate those characteristic features of the female mind which are well known the world over, and which it is our blessing not to have lost. The laws of nature are stronger than the theories of men." Professor Munsterberg proceeds:—

To express the matter in a psychological formula, on which the observations of all times and all nations have agreed: In the female mind the contents of consciousness have the tendency to fuse into a unity, while they remain separated in the man's mind. Both tendencies have their merits and their defects; but, above all, they are different, and make women superior in some functions and man superior in some others. The immediate outcome of that feminine mental type is woman's tact and æsthetic feeling, her instinctive insight, her enthusiasm, her sympathy, her natural wisdom and morality; but, on the other side, also, her lack of clearness and logical consistency, her tendency to hasty generalization, her mixing of principles, her undervaluation of the abstract and of the absent, her lack of deliberation, her readiness to follow her feelings and emotions. Even these defects can beautify the private life, can make our social surroundings attractive, and soften and complete the strenuous, earnest and consistent public activity of the man;—but they do not give the power to meet these public duties without man's harder logic. If the whole national civilization should receive the feminine stamp, it would become powerless and without decisive influence on the world's progress.

RIGHTS OF THE MAJORITY.

THE women who in Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, Maine, Iowa, Washington, Oregon and other states have organized to oppose measures for the further extension of the suffrage to women represent the overwhelming majority of their sex. When they appeal to legislatures not to enact the bills which are pressed upon them by the advocates of woman suffrage, they ask them to act on the time-honored American principle that, in matters of con-

troversy, the will of the majority should govern.

The women who ask the ballot represent not only a minority, but a small minority of women. This was proved beyond dispute on the only occasion when there was any opportunity officially to test the views of women upon this question,—the "referendum" in Massachusetts in 1895. At that time, the male voters of the state, and all women who had the qualifications entitling them to vote for school committee, were invited to answer "Yes" or "No" to the question whether it was expedient to give the municipal ballot to women.

The irritation which Massachusetts suffragists usually manifest when speaking since of this "referendum" is perhaps explained by the disappointing result, from their point of view. Some weeks in advance of the vote, the *Woman's Journal* said confidently:—

After next November, therefore, Massachusetts suffragists will probably have a right to claim that they speak for a majority of the women.

The election, however, so far from giving the suffragists such a right, showed them to be in a small minority. Out of 608,500 potential women legal voters in the state, who might have declared their desire for the municipal ballot, at the invitation of the legislature, only 22,204 did so.

Assuming that about the same division exists among women in other states where suffragists ask the extension of the suffrage to women, the real question before legislators is whether they will regard the wishes of about four per cent of women who want the ballot or of the ninety-six per cent who do not.

A SINGLE SUCCESS.

THE legislatures of more than thirty states were in session in 1901, and in most of them, excepting in the Southern states, some proposition for giving the ballot to women was introduced. In only a single instance did the suffrage movement succeed. This was in New York, where the so-called Kelsey Women Taxpayers' Bill was passed. The new law, which relates only to women who are property owners, gives women who pay taxes in townships and villages the right to vote on all propositions to raise money by bond or assessment. A curious anomaly results from the passage of this bill. Hitherto, a man whose wife owned property which was taxed, but who owned no property himself voted at taxpayers' elections by virtue of his wife's property. He does not lose this right under the new order of things; but his wife is privileged to vote on her own account. The result is that a single piece of property confers voting privileges upon two persons.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN ENGLAND.

MR. I. N. FORD, the well-known London correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, in a letter dated April 3, 1901, and published in the *Tribune* for April 13, gave an interesting account of the workings of woman suffrage in England. His conclusions, which are those of an intelligent correspondent, concerned only to collect and report the facts, will carry weight with all who know Mr. Ford's reputation for candor and for breadth and accuracy of information.

Mr. Ford opened his letter with the remark that "Woman suffrage in the United Kingdom is in a state of arrested development." He attributed this condition to the concessions made in local elections, "which have served to indicate that the extension of suffrage has neither interested the main body of women nor made any appreciable difference in political results." From the apathy shown by women in local contests, "practical politicians have drawn the inference that it would be idle to grant an extension of suffrage so as to enable women to vote at Parliamentary elections."

Mr. Ford described in detail the restrictions placed upon women's use of the ballot and the intricate requirements of registration. For example, in that part of London known as the "City," women may vote for the county council and the board of guardians, but not for the school board. In the rest of the metropolis they may vote for the board of guardians, the borough councils, the school board and the county council. Their rights are ampler in Scotland than in England and Wales, and in Ireland, since the legislation of 1898, ampler than in Scotland or England. The political rights accorded to women in local government are not given them on equal terms with men. Thus, no woman can vote merely because she is an owner of property, but she must be an occupier; no woman can vote as a lodger; and there is no service franchise for women corresponding to that exercised by men who occupy buildings as officials, janitors or servants.

According to Mr. Ford, not many London women concern themselves with municipal issues. The London Guardians maintain over 100,000 paupers, at a cost of more than \$20,000,000 annually.

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN 1899.

Proposed woman suffrage amendments to state constitutions were defeated in the legislatures of Iowa, Massachusetts, Nevada, Missouri, and Washington. School suffrage bills were rejected in Arkansas and New Mexico and killed in California by the pocket veto of the governor. Municipal suffrage bills were defeated in Connecticut and Massachusetts, and license suffrage bills in Illinois and Massachusetts. Taxpaying suffrage bills failed in Illinois and Maine, a presidential suffrage bill in Illinois, and bills granting women full suffrage in Arizona, Oklahoma, and West Virginia.

IN 1900.

Proposed woman suffrage amendments to state constitutions were rejected by the legislatures of Iowa and Ohio, and defeated at the polls in Oregon. A municipal suffrage bill was defeated in Massachusetts, and a women taxpayers' municipal suffrage bill in Vermont.

IN 1901.

In Alabama, the Constitutional Convention, after adopting a proposition to admit women taxpayers to the franchise in municipal elections called for the purpose of issuing bonds or incurring debt, reconsidered its action and rejected the proposition.

In California, a constitutional amendment empowering women to vote for school trustees and boards of education, and at school-bond and school-tax-levy elections, passed the House, but was defeated in the Senate.

In Connecticut, a municipal suffrage bill passed the Senate, but was defeated in the House.

In Indiana, a resolve submitting a woman suffrage constitutional amendment was defeated in the legislature.

In Kansas, a presidential suffrage bill was defeated.

In Massachusetts, a resolve for a suffrage constitutional amendment was defeated in the House by a vote of 29 to 132. The House accepted, without debate, an adverse report on a municipal suffrage bill.

In New Mexico, the House rejected a school suffrage bill: 2 to 21.

In Oregon, a resolve for a re-submission of the proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution was defeated in the House.

In South Dakota, the legislature rejected a resolve for a suffrage constitutional amendment.

In Wisconsin, a resolve for a suffrage amendment received but one favorable vote in the Senate.

Women are not only privileged to vote for guardians, but are eligible as members of the local boards; yet few of them vote in the triennial election, and this vast system of relief is administered mainly by men. The borough councils, under the London Government Act of 1899, are substituted for the old-time vestries; women are allowed to vote for them, but Mr. Ford writes: "The creation of twenty-eight cities out of the chaos of vestrydom did not appeal to the imagination of women, and they took little interest in the first borough elections last autumn." The only metropolitan elections in which women show an interest, he adds, are the school-board contests.

Regarding women's participation in local government, Mr. Ford remarks:—

The results, instead of stimulating interest in woman suffrage, have tended to paralyze it. Only a small minority of women qualified to exercise political rights cast their ballots at the elections, and there has been no marked increase of zeal for undertaking the routine work of local administration. Woman suffrage has had in the past distinguished champions in and out of Parliament, and once in a while there is a dress parade debate in the House of Commons; but public interest in the political enfranchisement of women has steadily declined during the last twenty years. The trend of recent experience indicates that the old-time agitators were not justified in forecasting any large access of political interest as the outcome of extension of suffrage to women. When the opportunity of enlarged usefulness and civic responsibility is offered, it is sluggishly accepted, without any appreciable result in the improvement of local government.

SUFFRAGE BILLS IN MASSACHUSETTS.

THE *Boston Journal* of March 16, 1901, commented editorially on the action of the Massachusetts legislature on several suffrage propositions in these words:—

This has not been a halcyon year for the cause of woman suffrage in the legislature. Two propositions were introduced: One a resolve providing for submitting to the people an amendment striking out the word "male" from the constitution; the other a bill giving the ballot in municipal elections to taxpaying women. Both propositions were reported adversely; the Committee on Constitutional Amendments voted against the first, 8 to 3, the Committee on Election Laws voted against the second, 10 to 1.

After devoting a large part of two sessions to debate, in which most of the time was consumed by suffrage advocates, the House defeated the proposed constitutional amendment resolve by a vote of 29 to 132. There were 24 pairs, so that altogether 53 members went on record in favor of the resolve, and 156 opposed. Last year there was no roll-call in the House on this proposition; but in 1899 it was rejected by a vote of 31 yeas to 82 nays; in 1898, by a vote of 44 yeas to 97 nays; in 1897, by a vote of 53 yeas to 86 nays. Or, to state it differently, the majority against the amendment was 33 in 1897, 53 in 1898, 51 in 1899, not recorded in 1900, and 103 in 1901—or more than three times as great this year as four years ago.

The other proposition, the bill to give municipal suffrage to taxpaying women, was specially assigned for debate in the House on Thursday, but when it was reached no one seemed inclined to speak for it, and the adverse report of the committee was accepted without a word of discussion and without a division.